

### **REMARKS**

Claims 2-14 are pending in the present application. Claims 2-14 have been amended and claim 1 has been canceled. Claims 6, 9 and 13 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

#### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 8, 12 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Chen, USPN 5,683,310. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chen, USPN 6,743,120. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

At the outset, it is respectfully pointed out to the Examiner that the Chen '120 reference was improperly cited on the PTO-892 as USPN 6,473,120 to Hirose et al. However, it is believed that the Examiner has relied on USPN 6,743,120 to Chen. In view of this, it is requested that the Examiner confirm that the Chen '120 reference has been relied on by the Examiner and it is also requested that the Examiner cite the Chen '120 reference on a PTO-892 form.

With regard to the merits of the Examiner's rejection, as the Examiner will note, independent claim 1 has been canceled and dependent claims 6, 9 and 13 have been rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of original independent claim 1. In the Examiner's Office Action dated March 8, 2005, the Examiner indicated that claims 6, 9 and 13 were directed to allowable subject matter. In view of this, it is believed that independent claims 6, 9 and 13 are now in condition for allowance.

With regard to dependent claims 2-5, 7, 8, 11, 12 and 14, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable due to their respective dependence upon independent claims 6, 9 and 13, as well as due to the additional recitations in these claims.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-9 and 11-14 clearly define the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

#### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As mentioned above, independent claim 1 has been canceled. However, it is believed that the subject matter of claim 1 that has been added to independent claims 6, 9 and 13 is definite and clear. In addition, the dependent claims have been carefully reviewed and revised, taking into consideration the specific deficiencies pointed out by the Examiner.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-14 are definite and clear. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph are respectfully requested.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 6, 9, 10 and 13 have been indicated by the Examiner as being allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant greatly appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter by the Examiner.

As mentioned above, dependent claims 6, 9 and 13 have been presented in independent form. In addition, these claims have been amended to address the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. In view of this, it is believed that all of the pending claims 2-14 are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and early allowance of the present application are therefore respectfully requested.

### **CONCLUSION**

Since the remaining references cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but merely to show the state-of-the-art, no further comments are deemed necessary with respect thereto.

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

Application No. 10/809,403  
Amendment dated September 7, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of March 8, 2005

Docket No.: 0229-0798PUS1

Page 13 of 13

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Paul C. Lewis, Registration No. 43,368 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Dated: September 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Paul C. Lewis

Registration No.: 43,368

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant